



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/696,467	10/28/2003	Yu Kwong Ng	CSCO-7059	6905

7590 08/17/2006

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
Third Floor
Two North Market Street
San Jose, CA 95113

EXAMINER

WALTER, CRAIG E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2188	

DATE MAILED: 08/17/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/696,467	Applicant(s) NG ET AL.	
	Examiner Craig E. Walter	Art Unit 2188	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 June 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 and 26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 and 26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 30 June 2006 has been entered.

Status of Claims

2. Claims 1-20 and 26 are pending in the Application.

Claims 21-25 remain cancelled.

Claims 1, 15 and 26 are amended.

Claims 1-20 and 26 are rejected.

Response to Amendment

3. Applicant's arguments filed on 30 June 2006 in response to the Office Action mailed on 5 April 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Therefore, the rejections made in the previous Office Action are maintained, and restated below, with changes as needed to address the amendments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Brandin et al., hereinafter Brandin (US Patent 6,493,813 B1).

As for claim 7, Brandin teaches a hashing apparatus, comprising:

a memory which stores a plurality of partial keys used to determine hashing conflicts (Fig. 13a illustrates two partial keys (elements 316 and 320). Referring to Fig. 1, the memory management system (20) has three elements including the transform generator, a controller and the memory table (26). The keys (which are split into partial keys as illustrated in Fig. 13a-b), are provided to the transform generator – col. 2, lines 54-57).

Referring to Fig. 9, each key is stored as an entry in the memory table (i.e. 10(exp)8 keys) – The transform generator determines an address and a confirmer for each key (col. 2, lines 47-48. The information determined from each of the keys (or partial keys as shown in Fig. 13a) is used to prevent the occurrence of collisions (i.e. hashing conflicts) – col. 2 lines 21-30);

a hash function block coupled to a memory that applies any polynomial to a full key and generates a hash value which is used to point to one of the plurality of partial keys stored in the memory wherein the partial keys include saved bits comprising a consecutive, sequential string of bits derived from the original key (col. 2, lines 54-65 – the transform generator uses polynomial code to generate address and confirmer information (i.e. hash value) for the key – This procedure is applied to partial keys in Fig 13a. – the original key (element 312) is split into partial keys, and the hash function is applied. Additionally, referring to Fig. 13a, the original key (element 312) is comprised of two partial keys (elements 316 and 320). The bits in each partial key are stored in a sequential line (based on the key length), each containing less bits than the original key – col. 7, lines 14-39). Additionally note that addressing and pointer information is stored directly in the memory as per col. 2, line 66 through col. 3, line 11;

As for claim 8, Brandin teaches the hashing apparatus of Claim 7, wherein the memory comprises a $2^{(exp)N}$ hash table size (referring to Fig. 3, the store table example used (element 50) contains 16 entries (i.e. $N=4$)).

As for claim 9, Brandin teaches the hashing apparatus of Claim 7, wherein the one of the plurality of partial keys stored in the memory comprises a number of bits equal to or more than the number of bits of the original key minus the number of bits of the hash value (referring again to Fig. 13a, partial key A

(element 316) is input into the LFSR to generate a hash value (transform) which is equal in size to the partial key. Since the partial key is half the original key's size, the partial key is equal to the size of the original key minus the hash value – col. 7, lines 14-39).

As for claim 10, Brandin teaches the hashing apparatus of Claim 7, wherein the hash function block comprises a linear feedback shift register (Fig. 12, element 312 illustrates the LFSR – col. 7, lines 9-11).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brandin as applied to claim 7 above, and in further view of Rajski et al., hereinafter Rajski (US PG Publication 2002/0016806 A1).

As for claims 11 and 12, Brandin fails to teach his LFSR as corresponding to either a Fibonacci, or a Galois version.

Rajski however teaches a method for synthesizing linear finite state machines, which includes both the Fibonacci, or a Galois versions – paragraph 0002, lines 17-20 and paragraph 0003, lines 1-4 – both types are described in his teachings.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Brandin to further implement Rajski's method for synthesizing linear finite state machines for his own LFSRs. By doing so, Brandin would be able to more efficiently implement his LFSR with fewer levels of logic, and a lower internal fan-out of the circuitry, as taught by Rajski (paragraph 0012, lines 1-18).

6. Claims 1-4 and 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brandin in further view of Biran (US Patent 6,345,347 B1).

As for claim 1, Brandin teaches a method for hashing, comprising:

storing a plurality of partial keys in memory (Fig 13a illustrates two partial keys (elements 316 and 320). Referring to Fig. 1, the memory management system (20) has three elements including the transform generator, a controller and the memory table (26). The keys (which are split into partial keys as illustrated in Fig. 13a-b), are provided to the transform generator – col. 2, lines 54-57. Referring to Fig. 9, each key is stored as an entry in the memory table (i.e. $10^{[exp]8}$ keys));

applying a hash function to an original key to generate a hash value, wherein said hash function comprises any polynomial (col. 2, lines 54-65 – the transform generator uses polynomial code to generate address and confirmer information (i.e. hash value) for the key – This procedure is applied to partial keys in Fig 13a.);

accessing the memory according to the hash value (the address and confirmer information (i.e. hash value) is used to locate the data in the memory – col. 2, lines 47-49);

reading a partial key from the memory corresponding to the hash value, wherein said hash value is based on said original key (the controller is used to look up the key's association in the memory table based on the information provided by the hash function (the address and confirmer) – col. 2, line 67 through col. 3, line 11). The entry containing the partial key is read in order to obtain this information. Again, Fig. 13a illustrates that this can be applied to the partial keys if the original key is greater than 64 bits;

Note giving the limitation “reading a partial key from the memory that corresponds to said hash value, wherein said hash value is based on said original key” its “broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification” (In re Hyatt, 211 F.3d 1367, 1372, 54 USPQ2d 1664, 1667 (Fed. Cir. 2000)), reading a partial key may include reading the entire key (which is split into more than one partial key), since the each partial key is inherently read during the step of reading the key in its entirety. The hash value will always be “based on the original key” even if said value is only made up by a portion of the original key (i.e. the portion corresponding to the partial key).

Brandin further teaches executing a conflict check by comparing the confirmer of a partial key derived from the confirmer of an incoming full key with the confirmer of a partial key stored in the memory ((col. 2, line 66 through col. 3, line 11) – the first

confirmer (derived from the first partial key of the full key) is compared with a stored first confirmer at the first address). He fails to teach however, actually comparing the keys (in contrast he teaches comparing the values of hashing results produced by applying the transform generator to the keys).

Biran however teaches a system for address protection using a hardware-defined application key, which in fact directly compares the keys in order to mitigate hashing conflicts (col. 2, lines 58-67 – Biran teaches eliminating the possibility of conflicts occurring by directly comparing the keys (in contrast to Brandin's system of comparing the hashed values of the keys)).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Brandin to further implement Biran's address protection system using a hardware-defined application key in his own system. By including Biran's method of comparing the keys, rather than comparing the translated keys, Brandin would be able to compare keys that correspond uniquely to the appropriate hardware address, hence eliminating the possibility of hashing conflicts. This system could easily be implemented in hardware (i.e. Brandin's controller which is used to compare the translated keys), while minimizing processing overhead – col. 2, lines 58-67).

As for claim 15, Brandin teaches a hashing apparatus comprising:

means for storing a plurality of partial keys in memory (Fig 13a illustrates two partial keys (elements 316 and 320). Referring to Fig. 1, the memory management system (20) has three elements including the transform generator, a controller and the memory table (26). The keys (which are split into partial

keys as illustrated in Fig. 13a-b), are provided to the transform generator – col. 2, lines 54-57). Referring to Fig. 9, each key is stored as an entry in the memory table (i.e. $10[\text{exp}]8$ keys);

means for applying a hash function to an original key to generate a hash value, the hash function comprising any N bit polynomial (col. 2, lines 54-65 – the transform generator uses polynomial code to generate address and confirmer information (i.e. hash value) for the key – This procedure is applied to partial keys in Fig 13a.);

means for accessing the memory according to the hash value, wherein a position to save comprises any N consecutive bits (the address and confirmer information (i.e. hash value) is used to locate the data in the memory – col. 2, lines 47-49. Referring to Fig. 13a, the original key (element 312) is comprised of two partial keys (elements 316 and 320). The bits in each partial key are stored in a sequential line (based on the key length), each containing less bits than the original key – col. 7, lines 14-39);

means for reading a partial key from the memory corresponding to the hash value, wherein a size to save comprises (less than or equal to) N bits (the controller is used to look up the key's association in the memory table based on the information provided by the hash function (the address and confirmer) – col. 2, line 67 through col. 3, line 11. The entry containing the partial key is read in order to obtain this information. Again, Fig. 13a illustrates that this can be applied to the partial keys if the original key is greater than 64 bits);

Note giving the limitation “reading a partial key from the memory that corresponds to said hash value, wherein said hash value is based on said original key” its “broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification” (In re Hyatt, 211 F.3d 1367, 1372, 54 USPQ2d 1664, 1667 (Fed. Cir. 2000)), reading a partial key may include reading the entire key (which is split into more than one partial key), since the each partial key is inherently read during the step of reading the key in its entirety. The hash value will always be “based on the original key” even if said value is only made up by a portion of the original key (i.e. the portion corresponding to the partial key).

Brandin further teaches executing a conflict check by comparing the confirmer of a partial key derived from the confirmer of an incoming full key with the confirmer of a partial key stored in the memory ((col. 2, line 66 through col. 3, line 11) – the first confirmer (derived from the first partial key of the full key) is compared with a stored first confirmer at the first address). He also teaches the hash table size as $2(\exp)N$ (Fig. 2, 16 entries are disclosed). He fails to teach however, actually comparing the keys (in contrast he teaches comparing the values of hashing results produced by applying the transform generator to the keys).

Biran however teaches a system for address protection using a hardware-defined application key, which in fact directly compares the keys in order to mitigate hashing conflicts (col. 2, lines 58-67 – Biran teaches eliminating the possibility of conflicts occurring by directly comparing the keys (in contrast to Brandin’s system of comparing the hashed values of the keys)).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Brandin to further implement Biran's address protection system using a hardware-defined application key in his own system. By including Biran's method of comparing the keys, rather than comparing the translated keys, Brandin would be able to compare keys that correspond uniquely to the appropriate hardware address, hence eliminating the possibility of hashing conflicts. This system could easily be implemented in hardware (i.e. Brandin's controller which is used to compare the translated keys), while minimizing processing overhead – col. 2, lines 58-67).

As for claims 2 and 16, Brandin teaches the method of Claim 1 (and apparatus of claim 15), wherein the partial key from the memory corresponding to the hash value includes saved bits comprising a consecutive, sequential string of bits, less than or equal to N, which is part of the original key (referring to Fig. 13a, the original key (element 312) is comprised of two partial keys (elements 316 and 320). The bits in each partial key are stored in a sequential line (based on the key length), each containing less bits than the original key – col. 7, lines 14-39).

As for claims 3 and 17, Brandin teaches the method of Claim 2 (and apparatus of claim 16), wherein the partial key from the memory corresponding to the hash value comprises a number of bits equal to or more than the number of bits of the original key minus the number of bits of the hash value (referring again to Fig. 13a, partial key A (element 316) is input into the LFSR to generate a hash value (transform) which is equal in size to the partial key. Since the partial key is half the original key's size, the

partial key is equal to the size of the original key minus the hash value – col. 7, lines 14-39).

As for claims 4 and 18, Brandin teaches the method of claim 1 (and apparatus of claim 15), wherein the hash function is implemented by a linear feedback shift register (Fig. 12, element 312 illustrates the LFSR – col. 7, lines 9-11).

7. Claims 6 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combined teachings of Brandin and Biran as applied to claims 1 and 15 above, and in further view of Ji (US PG Publication 2005/0086363 A1).

As for claims 6 and 20, Brandin teaches the method of Claim 1 (and apparatus of claim 15), further comprising:

reading a result from the memory corresponding to the hash value (the address and confirmer information (i.e. hash value) is used to locate the data in the memory – col. 2, lines 47-49, and the controller is used to look up the key's association in the memory table based on the information provided by the hash function (the address and confirmer) – col. 2, line 67 through col. 3, line 11).

Brandin fails however to teach forwarding a packet of data according to the result read from the memory.

Ji however teaches a traffic flow management system through a multipath network, which uses a router to forward packets of data. The packets are forwarded in accordance with the information provided to system based on the hash value of the data being forwarded (paragraph 0026, lines 15-20).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Brandin to further implement Ji's traffic flow management system in order for Brandin to send information referenced by his memory store, as a series of packets. By doing so, Brandin would be able to more efficiently send data referenced by the memory store data, which would in turn improve the load balancing during data transmission (paragraph 008, lines 1-16).

8. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brandin as applied to claim 7 above, and in further view of Bryg et al., hereinafter Bryg (US Patent 6,430,670 B1).

As for claim 13, Brandin fails to teach the hashing apparatus of claim 7 further including a reverse function generator coupled to the memory wherein the reverse function generator generates the original key based on the one of the plurality of partial keys stored in the memory and hash value.

Bryg however teaches an apparatus and method for a virtual hashed page table in which his original hashing function is reversible. The hash index (containing a portion of the key, therefore it itself is a partial key) and tag are used to uniquely identify the original translation of the key. This procedure can be reversed by applying the reverse hash function on the hash result and the hash identifiers – col. 8, lines 4-21. Note the hash generator hardware is coupled to the system's memory (Fig. 8, element 131).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Brandin to further implement Bryg's apparatus and method for a virtual hashed page table. By doing so, Brandin would benefit from Bryg's virtual hash

translating by utilizing two unique address spaces (either multiple or single hashed page table method) – col. 1, lines 18-28. Bryg's apparatus would provide Brandin with a single architectural virtual hash page table, which supports both methods of virtual addressing. In turn Brandin would benefit by increasing the number of operating systems capable of managing the information, and more efficiently utilize the structure, which in the end would save the end user time and memory as taught by Bryg in col. 2, lines 28-40.

9. Claims 5 and 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combined teachings of Brandin and Biran as applied to claims 1 and 15 above, and in further view of Bryg et al., hereinafter Bryg (US Patent 6,430,670 B1).

As for claims 5 and 19, Brandin fails to teach the method of Claim 1 (and apparatus of claim 15), further comprising applying a reverse function on the partial key from the memory corresponding to the hash value to generate the original key.

Bryg however teaches an apparatus and method for a virtual hashed page table in which his original hashing function is reversible. The hash index (containing a portion of the key, therefore it itself is a partial key) and tag are used to uniquely identify the original translation of the key. This procedure can be reversed by applying the reverse hash function on the hash result and the hash identifiers – col. 8, lines 4-21.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Brandin to further implement Bryg's apparatus and method for a

virtual hashed page table. By doing so, Brandin would benefit from Bryg's virtual hash translating by utilizing two unique address spaces (either multiple or single hashed page table method) – col. 1, lines 18-28. Bryg's apparatus would provide Brandin with a single architectural virtual hash page table, which supports both methods of virtual addressing. In turn Brandin would benefit by increasing the number of operating systems capable of managing the information, and more efficiently utilize the structure, which in the end would save the end user time and memory as taught by Bryg in col. 2, lines 28-40.

10. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brandin as applied to claim 7 above, and in further view of Ji.

As for claim 14, Brandin fails to teach the hashing apparatus of claim 7 further comprising a forwarding engine coupled to the memory, wherein the forwarding engine forwards a data packet according to information read from the memory at an address corresponding to the one of the plurality of partial keys stored in the memory.

Ji however teaches a traffic flow management system through a multipath network, which uses a router to forward packets of data. The packets are forwarded in accordance with the information provided to system based on the hash value of the data being forwarded (paragraph 0026, lines 15-20).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Brandin to further implement Ji's traffic flow management system in order for Brandin to send information referenced by his memory store, as a series of packets. By doing so, Brandin would be able to more efficiently send data referenced by the

memory store data, which would in turn improve the load balancing during data transmission (paragraph 008, lines 1-16).

11. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brandin in further view of Biran and Bryg.

As for claim 26, Brandin teaches a method for accessing data, comprising:

storing a plurality of partial keys in memory (Fig 13a illustrates two partial keys (elements 316 and 320). Referring to Fig. 1, the memory management system (20) has three elements including the transform generator, a controller and the memory table (26). The keys (which are split into partial keys as illustrated in Fig. 13a-b), are provided to the transform generator – col. 2, lines 54-57). Referring to Fig. 9, each key is stored as an entry in the memory table (i.e. 10[exp]8 keys);

applying a function to an original key to generate a value (col. 2, lines 54-65 – the transform generator uses polynomial code to generate address and confirmer information (i.e. hash value) for the key – This procedure is applied to partial keys in Fig 13a.);

accessing the memory according to the value (the address and confirmer information (i.e. hash value) is used to locate the data in the memory – col. 2, lines 47-49);

reading the partial key from the memory corresponding to the value and based on the original key (the controller is used to look up the key's association in the memory table based on the information provided by the hash function (the

address and confirmer) – col. 2, line 67 through col. 3, line 11). The entry containing the partial key is read in order to obtain this information. Again, Fig. 13a illustrates that this can be applied to the partial keys if the original key is greater than 64 bits;

Note giving the limitation “reading a partial key from the memory that corresponds to said hash value, wherein said hash value is based on said original key” its “broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification” (In re Hyatt, 211 F.3d 1367, 1372, 54 USPQ2d 1664, 1667 (Fed. Cir. 2000)), reading a partial key may include reading the entire key (which is split into more than one partial key), since the each partial key is inherently read during the step of reading the key in its entirety. The hash value will always be “based on the original key” even if said value is only made up by a portion of the original key (i.e. the portion corresponding to the partial key).

Brandin further teaches executing a conflict check by comparing the confirmer of a partial key derived from the confirmer of an incoming full key with the confirmer of a partial key stored in the memory ((col. 2, line 66 through col. 3, line 11) – the first confirmer (derived from the first partial key of the full key) is compared with a stored first confirmer at the first address). He fails to teach however, actually comparing the keys in order to determine which data is accessed (in contrast he teaches comparing the values of hashing results produced by applying the transform generator to the keys).

Biran however teaches a system for address protection using a hardware-defined application key, which in fact directly compares the keys in order to mitigate hashing

conflicts (col. 2, lines 58-67 – Biran teaches eliminating the possibility of conflicts occurring by directly comparing the keys (in contrast to Brandin's system of comparing the hashed values of the keys)).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Brandin to further implement Biran's address protection system using a hardware-defined application key in his own system. By including Biran's method of comparing the keys, rather than comparing the translated keys, Brandin would be able to compare keys that correspond uniquely to the appropriate hardware address, hence eliminating the possibility of hashing conflicts. This system could easily be implemented in hardware (i.e. Brandin's controller which is used to compare the translated keys), while minimizing processing overhead – col. 2, lines 58-67).

Brandin further fails to disclose applying a reverse function on the partial key and hash value to generate the original key.

Bryg however teaches an apparatus and method for a virtual hashed page table in which his original hashing function is reversible. The hash index (containing a portion of the key, therefore it itself is a partial key and tag are used to uniquely identify the original translation of the key. This procedure can be reversed by applying the reverse hash function on the hash result and the hash identifiers – col. 8, lines 4-21). Note the hash generator hardware is coupled to the system's memory (Fig. 8, element 131).

Again, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for Brandin to further implement Bryg's apparatus and method for a virtual hashed page table. By doing so, Brandin would benefit from Bryg's virtual hash

translating by utilizing two unique address spaces (either multiple or single hashed page table method) – col. 1, lines 18-28. Bryg's apparatus would provide Brandin with a single architectural virtual hash page table, which supports both methods of virtual addressing. In turn Brandin would benefit by increasing the number of operating systems capable of managing the information, and more efficiently utilize the structure, which in the end would save the end user time and memory as taught by Bryg in col. 2, lines 28-40.

Response to Arguments

12. Applicant's arguments filed on 30 June 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

13. With respect to claim 7 (under the heading "102 Rejection"), Applicant asserts, "Brandin et al. does not teach or suggest a hashing apparatus that includes "a hash function block coupled to a memory that applies any polynomial to a full key and generates a hash value which is used to point of [sic] one of the plurality of partial keys stored in memory"". Examiner however maintains that Brandin does in fact teach, "a hash function block (Fig. 1 (22)) coupled to a memory (Fig. 1 (26)) that applies any polynomial to a full key and generates a hash value which is used to point to one of the plurality of partial keys stored in memory (col. 2, lines 54-65). More specifically, a key is received by the transform generator (hash function block) and split into an address portion, and confirmer portion (both of which when combined form the transform of the key). The controller subsequently stores (in the memory) an association for the key

Art Unit: 2188

based on the address and the confirmer. The memory contains, *inter alia*, the confirmer location, and a pointer location (col. 2, line 66 through col. 3, line 11). Referring to Figs. 13A and 13B, and col. 7 (lines 14-39), the hashing function can be applied to a key that exceeds 64-bits, in which the key will be split into partial keys (an example is shown for an 128-bit key split into two 64-bit sections). The partial keys are sent to the transform generator to generate the hash value for each partial key, which are then subsequently concatenated to form the hash value for the entire key. Note the memory stores the confirmer location and pointer location for each of the constituent parts of the full key separately (i.e. each partial key, since each partial key is separately hashed); therefore the stored hash value contains information (i.e. addresses) to point to each of the partial keys.

14. Applicant continues by making a general allegation that Brandin et al. only discloses a dissimilar method for forming a hashing code, and argues that Brandin fails to disclose partial keys as being stored at all. Examiner however maintains that Brandin et al. does in fact teach storing partial keys in memory, and would like to direct Applicant's attention to paragraph 12 of the final Office action mailed on 5 April 2006, which directly addresses this previously presented argument.

15. Applicant's argument that claims 8-10 are allowable for depending on claim 7 is rendered moot as Examiner maintains that claim 7 is anticipated by Brandin per the rejection and arguments presented *supra*.

16. As for claims 11-12 (under the heading 103 Rejections), Applicant asserts that Brandin et al. fails to anticipate these claims solely for inheriting the limitations of claim

7, and further argues that Rajski fails to cure the deficiencies of Brandin's teachings.

Applicant's arguments however are rendered moot as Examiner maintains that claim 7 is anticipated by Brandin per the rejection and arguments presented *supra*.

17. As for claims 1-4, and 15-18 (under the heading 103 Rejections), Applicant asserts, "Brandin et al. does not teach or suggest ... "reading a partial key from the memory that corresponds to said hash value, wherein said hash value is based on said original key"" as per recited in newly amended claims 1 and 15. Examiner however maintains that Brandin teaches reading a partial key from the memory that corresponds to said hash value based on said original key (col. 2, line 43 through col. 3, line 11). More specifically, the transform generator must inherently read the key in order to determine the transform of the key (i.e. address and confirmer). The key itself corresponds to the hash value via the transform generator (transform generator is used to transform the key into the address and the confirmer), and the memory is used to store the correspondence via confirmer locations and pointer locations (hence the memory is used to maintain the correspondence between the key and the hash value). Additionally note the hash value itself is based on the original key (hash value is a function of the transformation of the original key via the transform generator).

18. Note giving the limitation "reading a partial key from the memory that corresponds to said hash value, wherein said hash value is based on said original key" its "broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification" (In re Hyatt, 211 F.3d 1367, 1372, 54 USPQ2d 1664, 1667 (Fed. Cir. 2000)), reading a partial key may include reading the entire key (which is split into more than one partial key), since the

each partial key is inherently read during the step of reading the key in its entirety. The hash value will always be “based on the original key” even if said value is only made up by a portion of the original key (i.e. the portion corresponding to the partial key).

19. Applicant’s argument that Rajski fails to cure the deficiencies of Brandin’s teachings for this limitation is rendered moot as Examiner maintains that Brandin specifically teaches “reading a partial key from the memory that corresponds to said hash value, wherein said hash value is based on said original key” per the discussion *supra*.

20. As for claims 6 and 20, 13, 5 and 19, and 14 (under the heading 103 Rejections), Applicant asserts that neither Ji, Bryg, nor Biran fail to cure Brandin’s deficiencies with respect to the claim limitations “a hash function block coupled to a memory that applies any polynomial to a full key and generates a hash value which is used to point to one of the plurality of partial keys stored in memory”, and reading a partial key from the memory that corresponds to said hash value, wherein said hash value is based on said original key”. Examiner however maintains that Brandin does in fact teach these limitations per the discussions and rejections presented *supra*, hence the argument that Ji, Bryg and Biran fail to disclose these elements is rendered moot.

21. As for claim 26, Examiner maintains the rejection to this claim for the reasons discussed with claim 1 and 15. Examiner would like to point out that Applicant asserts that Brandin nor Biran fail to teach “reading a partial key from the memory that corresponds to said hash value”, however the claim as amended recites “reading a partial key from the memory that corresponds to said hash value and based on the

original key". Despite this distinction, Examiner still maintains that Brandin alone teaches both the former and latter of the two aforementioned limitations.

22. Applicant's argument that all remaining dependant claims are allowable for inheriting allowable subject matter from their respective base claims is rendered moot as Examiner maintains that Brandin either anticipates, or renders obvious in view of the remaining cited art, each currently pending base claim per the discussion and arguments *supra*.


Conclusion

23. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Craig E. Walter whose telephone number is (571) 272-8154. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30a - 5:00p M-F.

24. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mano Padmanabhan can be reached on (571) 272-4210. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.


Art Unit: 2188

25. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



Craig E Walter
Examiner
Art Unit 2188

CEW



MANO PADMANABHAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

8/6/06